



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV. — *The Perfect Forms in Later Greek from Aristotle to Justinian.*

BY PROFESSOR J. E. HARRY,
UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI.

MANY years ago, after futile attempts to find an example of the grammarians' λελύκω, *que j'ai fini de délier*, and λελύκοιμι, *möge gelöst haben*, I set about making a collection of all the perfect subjunctives, optatives and imperatives in classical Greek. This task was completed before La Roche's contributions to Greek grammar fell under my eye. Distrusting the German scholar's list,¹ as well as my own,² I went over the whole field carefully once more before I ventured to publish my results.³ The present paper seeks, with Aristotle as a starting-point, to continue the investigation down to the time of Justinian.⁴

¹ J. La Roche, *Beiträge zur griechischen Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1893, pp. 161-172.

² It was well that I did so, for I found several examples which had escaped our notice. La Roche's list is particularly defective for the later period.

³ See *Classical Review*, XIX, 347-354.

⁴ With the assistance of a few graduate students, I searched the classical field again, but succeeded in gleaned only one or two new (but unimportant) examples. La Roche apparently does not attempt to cite every occurrence: μεμνώμεθα, in Plato, *Phileb.* 31 A, is omitted, as is μεμνήηται in 35 E. This leaves us in the dark as to the frequency of a given form. The subjunctive, like the imperative, of even μέμνημαι and ἔστηκα (and other perfects employed as presents) does not occur very frequently, whereas εἰδῶ, εἰδῆς, etc., appear two hundred times in the classical literature alone. The imperatives ἴσθι, ἴστω, ἴστε are also, naturally, common. All the examples of μέμνησο and μέμνησθε are not given in La Roche's collection; κεκτήσθω is cited from Plato, *Leg.* 744 A, but not from 914 A; while παρέσταντε, *Soph. Ai.* 1183, and ἀπειργάσθω, *Rep.* 553 A, do not appear in the list at all. Moreover, very few of the eighty-four subjunctives given by La Roche are really *perfect* subjunctives—seventy-five at least have no more to do with past action than our auxiliaries "may" and "can," though in *form* they are past, as well as οἶδα and κέκτημαι. One of the examples cited is not even perfect in form (πεπλήγγη, *Ar. Av.* 1350), though Veitch agrees with the German scholar in designating the form a perfect subjunctive, and Sonnenschein declares (*C.R.* XIX, 440) that "the Perfect. Opt. . . represents in oblique form the meaning 'have thrown,' not 'throw': so, too, . . . the πεπλήγγη of Aristophanes

THE PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE.

In forty thousand Teubner pages of later Greek I have been able to find but two perfect subjunctives active, and one of these is active only in form: *οἶων ἂν εὐρήκη* (Athenaeus, 10. 7), *όκόταν παρὰ τὸ ἔθος ἡχοφορήκη ἡ κοιλή* (Galen, *περὶ ἐθῶν*, 111).

This paucity of examples of the subjunctive in the perfect active is all the more remarkable, as the later Greeks filled out the scheme of those verbs which were defective in the perfect indicative by mere mechanical inventions. Even liquid verbs, most of which in the classical literature lack this form, are rounded off with a high-sounding, mouth-filling perfect; *e.g.* *ἀποκεκέρδαγκα* (Dio Cass. 43. 18. 2), *ῥσχύνγει* (77. 16. 1), *ἀπεκτάγει* (Diod. Sic. 14. 47), *κεκρατύνθω* (Philostr. *Γym.* 32), *σεσημάγκαμεν* (Euseb. *Præf. Ev.* 13. 12. 7), *διασεσάφηκε* (13. 12. 12), *ῥεραδιουργήκασι* (*Hist. Eccl.* 5. 28. 13), *ἐντέταλκε* (Josephus, *Antiq.* 7. 14. 5), *πεπομπενκῶς* (*B.I.* 7. 5. 6), *διαπεφωνήκασιν* (*Ap.* 1. 3), *κεκατήρηνται* (LXX, *Num.* xxii. 6).¹ The pluperfect also becomes commoner in the later period. Some writers out-Xenophon Xenophon. The influence of the Latin tongue, too, is seen in the numerous pluperfect indicatives with *ἄν*; *e.g.* Galen, 1. 50 *ἂν ἡριθμήκεις*; Stob. *Floril.* (Meineke, II, p. 287), *εἰ γὰρ ὠφέλησο, πέπαυσο ἄν*.² In Pseudo-Plutarch, *C. Gracch.* 4, we find two unique protases, one with the perfect optative active (*εἴ τις ἄρχων ἄκριτον*

(*Birds*, 1350).³ But there can hardly be a doubt that Aristophanes introduced the archaic *πεπλήγη* solely for the legal coloring; the quaint Epic form gives the utterance the flavor of the bar—it smacks of the court: “whenever a pretty young chick to mayhem his father essayeth, the law no estoppel doth put.” The action in *δοῖς ἂν πεπλήγη τὸν πατέρα νεοττὸς ὦν* is certainly no more in the past than is the action of verbs in actual laws; such as, for example, Plato, *Leg.* 890 C: *ὅς δ' ἂν μὴ παρέχῃται ἑαυτὸν τοῖς νόμοις εὐπειθῆ, τὸν μὲν δεῖν τεθνάναι, τὸν δὲ πληγαῖς καὶ δεσμοῖς κτέ.* Cp. *Theæst.* 146 A *ὁ δὲ ἁμαρτῶν, καὶ ὅς ἂν ἀεὶ ἁμαρτάνη καθεδεῖται . . . ὄνος.*

¹ In classical Greek the aorist was employed. Cp. Isoc. 5. 19 ff.—nine perfects followed by *κατέστησεν*.

² This construction is found, of course, also in the classical period, as Dem. 18. 30 *ἂν διημαρτήκει*; Plato, *Hipp. Mai.* 289 D *ἂν ἀπεκέκριτο*; *Gorg.* 453 D *ἂν ἀπεκέκριτο*. See Gildersleeve, *Greek Syntax*, 429.

ἐκκεκηρύχιοι πολίτην), the other with the perfect middle (εἴ τινος ἄρχοντος ἀφηγήτο τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ δῆμος).

The perfect subjunctives that do occur in this period are such only in form.¹ They appear to be perfects to the grammarian who has become accustomed to associating temporal functions alone with reduplication. All the examples in later Greek are either onomatopoeic (or intensive) presents, pure and simple, or desperately present in the perfect — and even these are generally in the very verbs that appear in the perfect tense of the subjunctive and optative in the classical literature; *e.g.* Plotinus, *En.* 2. 4. 14 and 6. 6. 10 *συμβεβήκη*, a common form in Plotinus and Aristotle. The subjunctive *μεμύκη* in Moschus 3 is no more what we ordinarily understand as a perfect than *μεμυκότες* in Nonnus 8. 22 (*μεμυκότες ἔκλυε ταύρου*) is a perfect, or *μεμυκότες* in Josephus, *B.I.* 6. 5. 1 (*μαραινόμενοι καὶ μεμυκότες*), or *μεμακύναι* in Δ 435, or *κεκλαγγύναι* in Xenophon, *de Venat.* 6. 23. The last example is well worth quoting in full: ἐπιρριπτοῦσαι, παραπηδῶσαι, κοινωνοῦσαι, ὑπολαμβάνουσαι, ἐνσημαινόμεναι, ὄρους τιθέμεναι . . . αἱ δὲ διαρρίπτουσαι τὰς οὐρὰς καὶ ἑαυταῖς ἐμπίπτουσαι καὶ πολλὰ ὑπερπηδῶσαι καὶ ἐπανακλαγγάνουσαι ἐπαναίρουσαι τὰς κεφαλὰς, εἰσβλέπουσαι εἰς τὸν κυνηγέτην, ἐπιγνωρίζουσαι . . . ἀναστήσουσι τὸν λαγῶ καὶ ἐπ' αἰσι κεκλαγγύναι. But the other subjunctives in the Moschus passage show that "action in the past" is not expressed by this reduplicated form: ὅταν ἀχήση . . . ἐπαφρίζη, τὰ δὲ κύματα μακρὰ μεμύκη. Cp. κ 227 δάπεδον δ' ἄπαν ἀμφιμέμυκεν, μ 395 κρέα δ' ἀμφ' ὀβελόισι μεμύκειν, P 264 βέβρυχεν μέγα κύμα, 54 ἀναβέβρυχεν ὕδωρ, N 393 βεβρυχώς, μ 241 ff. φάνεσκε . . . ἐβεβρύχεν . . . φάνεσκεν.²

THE PERFECT OPTATIVE.

In considering the use and behavior of the perfect optative, it is important that we rid ourselves at the outset of the false

¹ I do not refer to the type represented by *συνεστήκη* (Dio Cass. 38. 36. 3), a list of the examples of which is given at the end of this paper.

² Cp. Brugmann, *Kurze vgl. Gram.* p. 493: "Auch eine Thätigkeit kann als Zustand aufgefasst werden, z. B. gr. μέμυκε 'er ist ins Brüllen gekommen und ist nun im Brüllen drin.'"

notion that the optative mood is rare in later Greek. We have been taught so often that this mood had almost disappeared from Greek literature by the beginning of our era, that some scholars had begun to feel that the optative is a factor we hardly have to reckon with in the later period. Such a misconception of the facts is likely to prove a constant impediment to clearness of vision. True, at one time and another the optative seems to vanish. So, too, the dual (Homeric and Attic) seems to die in the latter half of the fourth century B.C., — in some later Greek writings, as, for example, the Septuagint, it has completely disappeared, — but the form revives to a fuller and more vigorous, though more artificial, life in certain authors.¹ In certain narrow ranges of the literature the optative may be regarded as practically non-existent; as, for example, in the Gospels, with the single exception of Luke. In this sphere the subjunctive is the rule after historical tenses.² But while we would not expect to find abundant examples of the optative expressing a wish in the ordinary prose of any period, examples of other uses of this mood, which are prime favorites in the classical literature, are to be found very frequently in many writers from Aristotle to Justinian; and, particularly, from Diodorus Siculus down to the sixth century A.D. optatives may be counted not by hundreds but by thousands.

But the perfect optative active, though rare, occurs more frequently than the perfect subjunctive. By far the largest number of examples, however, are found in verbs whose perfects are either quasi-presents or real presents. Sporadic cases of the subjunctive and optative in this tense appear also in the classical writers from Homer to Demosthenes. The persistence of the perfects of these verbs in both the subjunctive and the optative moods in the later literature lends addi-

¹ Cp. Libanius 39. 15, 41. 14, and Aristides 1. 9 δύο τούτω συναγωγούσῳ τε καὶ ἰσχυροτάτῳ.

² In LXX the optative after secondary tenses is found practically only in *Maccabees*. In final clauses the subjunctive is used in both the LXX and N.T.; but in *Luke* and the *Acts* the optative is found in indirect questions. There are thirty-five pure optatives in N.T.

tional weight to my contention that these perfects in form were not perfect in meaning, but were really felt to be presents: Polyaeus 4. 17 ὡς Ἀντίοχος ἐν τῇ μάχῃ πεπτῶκοι; Arrian, *An.* 7. 22; Jos. *Antiq.* 12. 10. 3; Heliodorus 3. 7 (and often) πεπόνθοι, 2. 11; Jos. *Antiq.* 19. 2. 2 πεπόνθοιεν; Babrius 115, and Athen. 13. 85 πεποιήκοι; Julian, *Conv.* 330 B πάθοι πάντα ὅσαπερ δεδράκοι καὶ πεπόνθοι;¹ Lucian, *Hist. Vera* 7, 27. 7, 52. 5 μεμήνοι; Athen. 505 F; Heliod. 6. 2, 8. 1; Plut. *Dem.* 4 γεγόνοι, *Mor.* 225 E, *Cato* 55. 2; Jos. *Antiq.* 4. 7. 5 τεθνήκοι (cp. Plut. *Tim.* 16 ὑπὲρ πατρὸς τεθυνηκότος δὲ ἀπεκτονήκοι), *Anton.* 33 ἀπεκτόνοι; Philostratus, *App.* ὠρμήκοι; Heliod. 8. 15 ἐξωρμήκοι; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 5. 13. 5 ἐληλύθοι; Jos. *Antiq.* 18. 7. 1 ἐπανεληλύθοι; Justinian, *Const.* 10 and 48 κεθεστήκοι; Jos. *Antiq.* 17. 4. 3 ἀφεστήκοι, 19. 1. 19 ἀπολώλοι, 17. 11. 2 ἀπολώλοιεν; Aristides 1. 6 βεβήκοι, 47. 527 συνεστήκοι. The examples here enumerated include virtual presents, quasi-presents, and verbs which appear in the perfect optative in the classical literature. But sporadic cases of other verbs in this tense and mood are found in the later period. The optative *νενικήκοι* occurs in Plutarch, *Aratus* 16 and in *Pyrrhus* 18. The gravitation of this verb (denoting persistence of result itself) towards the perfect in later Greek is a particularly interesting phenomenon, since in the classical literature the present corresponds to the English perfect. The reduplicated form does not occur at all in Aristophanes or Dinarchus, only once in Aeschylus (*Eum.* 695), once in Lycurgus, twice in Andocides, five times in Lysias, and six in Isocrates, whereas in later Greek the indicative *νενίκηκα* and the participle *νενικηκώς* can be counted by hundreds. Cp. Plutarch, *Lucul.* 3 ἀνδρὶ τολμητῇ καὶ νενικηκότι; Libanius 27. 34 τὸν στέφανον τῶν τε νενικηκότων καὶ τῶν ἡττημένων. Scarcely less frequent in the perfect indicative is *αἰρέω* (*ἤρηνκα* never in Homer), which furnishes five examples of the optative: Plutarch, *Camil.* 22, *Pomp.* 5 (*ἀνηρήκοι*), and Philost. *App.* 5. 8 ἤρήκοι, Plut. *Caes.* 2, and Appian, *B.C.* 1. 22 ἤρήκοιεν. These are the only verbs which

¹ See my article in the *Classical Review*, XIX, 349. The contrast, *οἱ μὲν πεποιηκότες, οἱ δὲ πεπονθότες*, is frequent in later Greek.

show the perfect more than once. The remainder are (and nearly all the examples of this form are found either in indirect discourse or indirect questions): Plutarch, *Mor.* 578 D *ἱστορήκοι*, 581 D *ἀπονενοστήκοι*; Dio. Cass. 78. 13. 1 *ἐσχήκοι* (another verb which subsides towards the perfect in later Greek), 57. 14. 1 *εἰρήκοι*; Appian, *B.C.* 3. 9 *παραδεδώκοιεν*; Dio Cass. 57. 14. 1 *εὐρήκοι*; Plut. *Rom.* 14. 3 *ἀνευρήκοι*; Eusebius, *de Mart. Palaest.* 1. 4 *τεθύκοι*; Herodian 2. 1. 3 *τετελευτήκοι*, 8. 5. 6 *συμπεπνεύκοι*; Philostr. *Vita Soph.* 235 *ἐπιδεδώκοι*; Appian, *Han.* 51 *κεκρατήκοι*; Jos. *Antiq.* 17. 2. 4 *ἐσπονδάκοιεν*; Heliod. 5. 17 *καταμεμαθήκοι*.¹ The wonder is that more of these perfect optatives representing the indicative in oblique form do not appear in the later literature, especially as the periphrastic mode of expression in oratio obliqua, which is the rule in the classical idiom, almost disappeared in the Greek of the post-classical period.

THE PERFECT IMPERATIVE.

There is not a solitary example of the perfect imperative active of the second person in later Greek, excepting, of course, the virtual presents, like *κέκραχθι* (Lucian 5. 53), *δεῖδιθι* (47. 8), *δεῖδιχθι* (Nicand. *Alex.* 443), *δέδιχθι* (Babrius 75. 1). Of the third person two cases occur: *εἰληφέτω* (Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 10. 8. 17) and *μεμαθηκέτω* (EMS. Flor. Ioan. Damasc., Stob., Meineke, IV, p. 215).² The remaining perfects are present, for the most part intensive: Jos. *Antiq.* 4. 8. 34 *τεθνάτω*; Lucian 17. 42 *τεθηπέτω*, 25. 45 *βεβηκέτω*, 25. 49 *ἀκηκοέτω*, 51. 23 *κεχηνέτω*, 70. 18 *δεδορκέτω*³ (cf. Aesch. *Prom.* 679 *δεδορκώς* = *βλέπων, τηρῶν*).

Few examples of the second person of the perfect middle are found, except such virtual presents as *κάθησο*⁴ (Jos. *Antiq.*

¹ In an isolated verse, quoted from Cratinus by Athenaeus, we find *ἐδηδοκοίῃ*, which Porson emended to read *ἐδηδοκοίῃ*.

² Paul says *γυνὴ ἡσυχία μαθανέτω* (1 *Tim.* ii. 11), Libanius *μαθέτωσαν* (26. 10); Josephus writes *ὑπολάβῃ μηδὲς* (*Antiq.* 7. 4. 1), Aristides *μηδὲς ὑμῶν . . . καταγνῶ* (13. 162) — a construction which appears even in classical writers, when the third person involves a first. Cp. Plato, *Leg.* 861 E.

³ The periphrastic form is little used in any period.

⁴ Also LXX, 2 *Chr.* xxv. 19, but regularly *κάθου*.

2. 5. 2) μέμνησο, πεποίθετε (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 9. 11. 8)¹ κατάκεισο (Plut. *Cato Mai.* 17. 3), and the farewell expressions ἔρρωσθε and ἔρρωσο. The commonest form is πέπαυσο. If any verb would lend itself to use in this mood in the second person of the perfect, that verb would naturally be παύομαι. The present imperative παῦε is often reënforced by repetition, but while παῦε παῦε might indicate impatience, or a wish on the part of the speaker for the maintenance of the result of the action, the doublet does not emphasize a desire for everlasting cessation, as does πέπαυσο. As Aristides says (2. 30), κάμοι πεπαύσθαι καλὸν ἐνταῦθά που — hence I shall add only the references to examples; Aesop 50 and 60; Lucian 20. 81, 38. 3, 39. 77, 40. 4, 52. 36, 66. 39, 77. 1; Jos. *Antiq.* 11. 5. 6; Babrius 15; Athen. 13. 55; Philostr. *V.A.* 4. 14; Heliod. 5. 19 and 6. 2. Next to πέπαυσο in number is πεφύλαξο: Lucian, *de Imag.* 486; Plut. *Lys.* 29 (from an oracle); Aratus 930; Tryph. 278; Moschus 216; Athen. 6. 39 (from the younger Cratinus); Nonnus 1. 337, 17. 130, 23. 230, 34. 207, 36. 131, 37. 416, 38. 335, 45. 250. The form is merely an epic reminiscence. The same may be said of δέδεξο (Lucian 41. 25 and 53). The remainder are: κέκλισο (Anth. Pal. 7. 401. 8), πεπάλαχθε (Ap. Rhod. 1. 358) — an epic reminiscence, — πέπεισο (Pythag. in Stob. 1. 23 and Euseb. *Dem. Ev.* 4. 17. 23), πεπόνησο (Aratus 758), κέχρησο (Heliod. 1. 16 and 2. 10). The only example in the New Testament is πεφίμωσο (*Mark* iv. 39). In Athenaeus 3. 75 a perfect appears between two presents, σφακέλιζε καὶ πέπρησο καὶ βόα (quoted from Pherecrates 2. 287).

¹ Cp. πεποίθατε (LXX, *Jer.* ix. 4). Later writers introduce -a- forms everywhere: εἰπάτω, ἐλθάτω (*Jer.* xvii. 15); εἰσελθάτωσαν (*Ex.* xiv. 6); λαμβάτω (Just. M. 1 *Apol.* 16); εἰπάτωσαν (Liban. 45. 17). Sometimes a new present stem is built up on a perfect which is a virtual present, e.g. from ἐγρήγορα comes ἐγρηγόρει, which was regarded as an imperfect, hence γρηγορῶ, and then the regular aorist γρηγορήσατε (N.T. *Pet.* v. 8). Cp. LXX, *Jer.* xxxviii. 28 γρηγορήσω. Later Greek also forms a transitive perfect, ἔστακα. Cp. LXX, *Josh.* x. 19 ἐστάκατε, 1 *Mac.* xi. 34 ἐστάκαμεν, *Jer.* i. 10 καθέστακα; N.T. *Acts* viii. 11 ἔξεστακέναι. Josephus juxtaposes ἔστακὼς ἐστάτω (*Antiq.* 18. 8. 8). From ἔστηκα, too, a new present is formed, στήκω (N.T. *Rom.* xiv. 4). So ἐπεποίησα presupposes a πεποίηω (indicative).

THE PERIPHRASTIC PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE.

As in the earlier period, the periphrastic perfect subjunctive active is very rare: Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1. 12. 29 οἷς ἂν ἐγκληκότες ὦσι καὶ προδιακεχωρηκότες, 2. 5. 21 ἡδικηκότες ὦσιν; Plut. *Artax.* 16. 4 ἡ τεθνηκώς, *Mor.* 83 B and Lucian 73. 22 (γεγονὸς ἦ) ἡ γεγονός; Polyb. 6. 36. 9, 12. 25 a. 2 γεγονὸς ἦ, 6. 19. 4 ἡ τετελεκώς; Theophr. *Fr.* 6. 4. 50 δεδυκώς ἦ; N.T. 2 *Cor.* i. 9 πεποιθότες ὦμεν; *James* v. 15 ἡ πεποιηκώς; Athen. 3. 46 ἡ προσπεφυκυῖα; Galen 1. 59 πεπεικότες ὦμεν; Aristides 43. 363 ἐστηκός ἦ; Euseb. *Dem. Ev.* 2. 3. 14, 2. 3. 95 πεποιθότες ὦσιν;¹ Nicolaus (Stob. IV, 127) ἀπεκτονὸς ἦ; Lucian 47. 23 ἀνεληλυθότες ὦσι; Jos. *Antiq.* 8. 14. 2 ὦσι προσεληλυθότες; Aelian, *Nat. An.* 4. 52 ἡ πεπωκώς; Arat. 903 εἰκότες ὦσιν; LXX, *Is.* viii. 14 πεποιθὼς ἦς, x. 27, xvii. 8 πεποιθότες ὦμεν.

The periphrastic passive is also of infrequent occurrence, and many of the examples which do appear are found in citations from the earlier literature: Arist. *Eth. Nicom.* 6. 2. 6 ἡ πεπραγμένα (from Agathon), *Dial.* 57 ἡ πεπαιδευμένη, ἡ κεκοσμημένος, *Phys.* 211 B διηρημένος ἦ, *de Caelo* ἡ διηρημένον (= adj.), *Met.* A 988 a ἰδρυμένος ἦ; Plut. *Moral.* 42 D ἡ κεκεραμυμένον, 81 D ἡ γεγευμένη (from Aeschylus); *Luke* xiv. 9 ἡ κεκλημένος, i. 4 ἡ πεπληρωμένη; *John* iii. 27, vi. 65 ἡ δεδομένον (also Proclus 1. 1); 1 *Cor.* i. 10 ἦτε κατηρτισμένοι, 2 *Cor.* ix. 3 παρεσκευασμένοι ἦτε, Lucian, *Philopseu.* 49 εἰργασμένος ἦ, *Zeus Trag.* 680 δεδογμένον ἦ; Dio Chrys. 21. 270 ἡ τεθραμμένος; Galen 1. 26 ἦς παρεσκευασμένος; Onosander 50 κεχρημένος ἦ; Aristides 54. 75 ἡ κεκτημένος; Plotinus, *En.* 61. 1. 23 κεκαλυμμένος ἦ; Libanius 30. 20 εἰργασμένος ἦ; Jos. *Antiq.* 4. 8. 23 ἡ γεγεννημένη; Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* 8. 7. 8 ἐωνημένος ἦς.²

¹ This appears in La Roche as *πεπονθότες*. More frequently, however, the form in his list is right, while the citation is incorrect.

² The comparative frequency of the second person in this periphrasis seems to indicate that the doctrine sometimes promulgated, that the periphrastic conjugation in the subjunctive is practically limited to the third person, is untenable. There is small scope for the first and second persons in any event in the extant prose; and the number of periphrastic forms in this mood in the whole literature is not great.

THE PERIPHRASTIC PERFECT OPTATIVE.

Perfect optatives, even in periphrastic form, are not common in the later period: Arist. *Oec.* 2. 2. 15 εἰληφώς εἴη, 2. 2. 23 ἀκηκώς εἴη, *Dial.* 82 ἂν εἰρηκώς εἴη, *de Part. An.* 3. 5. 29 εἴη ἀποδεδωκυῖα; Polyb. 4. 15. 2 εἰσβεβληκότες εἴησαν,¹ 13. 5. 2 πεφευγώς εἴη, 15. 4. 3 παραβεβηκότες εἴην, 30. 15. 4 εὖρηκώς εἴη; Lucian 5. 53 εἴην νενικηκώς, 41. 32, 59. 2 εἴη κεκοινωνηκώς; Plut. *Alex.* 27 εἴη διαπεφευγώς, 60 εἴη διαβεβηκώς, *Mor.* 5 E ἀπολωλεκώς εἴη; Pausan. 3. 9. 2 ἀναβεβηκώς εἴη, 5. 19. 10 ἂν εἴη πεποιηκώς, Diod. Sic. 3. 73. 1 προειρηκώς εἴη, 13. 41. 4 πεπεικώς εἴη, 17. 41 πεπλακώς εἴη; Theophylactus 77 B εἴη νενικηκός; Dio Chrys. 31. 310 ἂν εἴην πεποιηκώς; Dio Cass. 36. 52. 4 προσεἰληφώς εἴη, 37. 8. 2 πεπονθώς εἴη, 37. 38. 2 σεσωκώς εἴη, 39. 45. 3 ἐπταικώς εἴη, 44. 15. 3 εἰρηκυῖα εἴη, 47. 25. 3 ἡλευθερωκώς εἴη, 60. 25. 3 ὠκοδομηκώς εἴη, 63. 29 ἀπεληλυθώς εἴη, 76. 3. 2 κεκελευκώς εἴη, *Rompr.* 36. 33. 5 προσεἰληφώς εἴη; Athen. 2. 72 ἂν εἴη εἰρηκώς; Arrian, *An.* 3. 19. 3 and 4 ἐγνωκώς εἴη, 3. 19. 5 εἴη πεφευγώς, 3. 21. 1 ξυνεἰληφότες εἴην, 4. 9. 3 ἀποτετικώς εἴη, 4. 30 (7. 6, 8. 1) ἀποπεφευγότες εἴην, 5. 20. 7 ἀπεκτονότες εἴην, 6. 8. 1 πεφευγότες εἴην, 6. 12. 1 τεθνηκώς εἴη; Aristides 34. 155 ἂν δεδωκότες εἴην; Porphyry (p. 7 Nauck) ἐντετυχηκώς εἴη; Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* 12. 28. 1 εἴη γεγονότα ἄν, *Dem. Ev.* 1. 3. 17 ἀφεστώς εἴη, *Hist. Eccl.* 5. 16. 20 μεμαρτυρηκότες εἴην; Philostr. *Vita Ap.* μεμαθηκώς ἂν εἴην; Plotin. *En.* 4. 3. 21 συμβεβηκός ἄν εἴη; Appian, *B.C.* 2. 81 κατωρθωκότες εἴην; Jos. *Antiq.* 2. 6. 7 εἴην ἀποκεκυφότες, 2. 7. 1 εἴη διαπεφευγώς, 2. 7. 6 βεβιωκώς εἴη (bis), 4. 8. 38 εἴη παρεσχικώς, 10. 10. 3 εἴη ἐορακώς, εἴη προσεταχώς, 11. 6. 13 εἴη γεγονός, 13. 2. 2 πεπονθώς εἴη, 13. 5. 10 εἴην ἐστρατοπεδευκότες, 15. 6. 3 εἰληφώς εἴη, 16. 9. 1 ἀπολωλώς εἴη.

Nor is the passive exceedingly frequent: Arist. *Phys.* 4. 208 B ἂν εἴη ἐστερημένον, 4. 13. 222 A εἴη πεπερασμένον, *Dial.* 55 διεφθαρμένος εἴη, *Met.* 1. 988 A ἄν τι εἴη ὠρισμένον . . . ἀπηλλαγμένοι ἂν εἴημεν . . . εἰρημένον ἂν εἴη; Jos. *Antiq.* 19. 1. 17 πεπραγμένον εἴη; Lucian, *περὶ πένθους*, 9 εἴη καταλε-

¹ Cp. the solitary example of the optative of this verb in oblique form in Thucydides 2. 48. 2.

λειμμένος, πρὸς τὸν ἀπαιδευτον, 6 κεκοσμημένα εἴη, 15 ἂν εἰρημένον εἴη; Plut. *Mar.* 8 εἴη προστετριμμένος, *Alex.* 27 εἴη τετιμωρημένος, *Lycurg.* 24 εἴη προστεταγμένου, *Mor.* 161 C εἴη δεδογμένον, 259 F εἴη κεκρυμμένος; Dionys. Hal. *Rom. Antiq.* 1. 101 πεπρωμένον εἴη, 7. 1352 κεκωλυμένος εἴη; Pausan. 5. 11. 11 εἴη πεπονημένα; Diod. Sic. 37. 12. 3 εἴη συντετελεσμένον, 14. 21. 3 εἴεν προκατειλημμένοι, 14. 47. 2 δεδογμένον εἴη, 19. 24. 4 εἴη πεπονημένος, 31. 30 προκεκλημένος εἴη; Dio Cass. 77. 3. 3 πεφυγαδευμένοι εἴεν; Athen. 2. 50 εἴη γεγεννημένη; Dio Chrys. 1. 66 δεδομένον εἴη, 36. 442 ἂν εἴητε ἡσθημένοι; Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* 8. 8. 29 εἴη κεχαρισμένος, 8. 12. 21 ἀποδοδομένος εἴη; *Dem. Ev.* 1. 5. 7 εἴη . . . εὐλογημένον, 9. 11. 9 ἀπεσταλμένος εἴη; Galen 3. 909 ἡπειγμένον εἴη; Zonaras 3. 26 ἐξηρημένος εἴη; Maximus 4. 5 πεφυλαγμένος εἴης, 5. 105 κεχαρημένη εἴη; Nicephorus, *Opus Hist.* (init.) ἂν δεδομένα εἴη, 53 B ἡθετημένος εἴη; Euseb. Pamphil. *ad. Hierocl.* 22 πεπραγμένα εἴη; Porphyry, *de Vita Plotin.* (last sentence) ἡμαρτημένον εἴη; Plotin. *En.* 6. 1. 27 παραλελειμμένον ἂν εἴη; Heliodor. 5. 10 εἴη διαπεπραγμένος (bis), 8. 15 εἴη καταλελειμμένος; Nonnus 37. 202 μεμελημένος εἴη.

THE PERFECT IMPERATIVE PASSIVE.

The perfect imperative passive of the third person occurs more frequently than in classical writers and is more evenly distributed; the form is not confined, as in the earlier period, to a few authors.¹ The commonest verb is εἰρήσθω (about four score in the aggregate)—a perfect imperative which is found occasionally even in Strabo (*e.g.* 1. 1. 23). The third plural (εἰρήσθωσαν) occurs in Arist. *Eth. Nicom.* 4. 5. 15. The compound προεἰρήσθω appears in Justin. *Const.* 48, προσειρήσθω in Philostr. *Vita Soph.* 211. The form λελέχθω, though not so common as εἰρήσθω, is not rare.² ὠρίσθω is

¹ La Roche's list is far from being exhaustive. There are many omissions even in the authors mentioned. Mistakes in citation are frequent; *e.g.* πεπεράνθω, Plato, *Leg.* 671 E should be διαπεπεράνθω (672 E), or the simple form from another section.

² Pausan. 8. 17. 4; Arrian, *An.* 5. 6. 8; Dio Chrys. 7. 256, 35. 432; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 5. 20. 3; Plotin. *En.* 1. 4. 3, 5. 5. 6; Apollod. 3. 3. 2; Theophylactus

also common: eight times in Aristotle (simple or compound), twice in Lucian (*ᾠρίσθωσαν* once), twice in Plutarch, twice in Pausanias, and once each in Iamblichus, Themistius, and Theophrastus. Strabo gives us *ἄφωρίσθω*, and Philostratus *περιωρίσθω*. Hardly less frequent is *ἡρήσθω* and its compounds (never in pre-Aristotelian Greek): Arist. *de Cael.* 31. 314; Luc. 67. 11. 4 *ἀφηρήσθω* and *διηρήσθω*; Plot. *En.* 4. 7. 1 (and often); Appian, *B.C.* 4. 38 and Justin. *Const.* 48 *ἐξηρήσθω*; Synesius, *Dion* and Philostr. *Vita Soph.* 264 *ἐξηρήσθων*. In Aristotle *εἰλήφθω* is especially frequent; also in compounds: Luc. 7. 2 *κατειλήφθω*; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 6. 19. 5 *παρειλήφθω*, *Praef. Ev.* 10. 11. 6 *ὑπειλήφθω*. Many authors use the compounds of *εἶσθω*: Luc. 15. 50 *καθείσθω*; Appian, *Illyr.* 3 *μεθείσθω*; Libanius 27. 43 *ἀφείσθω* (also Jos. *Antiq.* 4. 8. 28); Aristides 33. 99, 45. 129, 46. 367; Appian, *B.C.* 5. 47 *ἀφείσθωσαν*; Liban. 30. 37, and Aristides 3. 34 *παρείσθω*; Jos. *Antiq.* 5. 2. 12 *ἐφείσθω*. The epic *τεθνάτω* is also found in later Greek (Jos. *Antiq.* 4. 8. 34). The Platonic *γεγράφθω* is used by later writers in both simple and compound form: Arrian, *An.* 5. 4. 1, Luc. 17. 42; Appian, *B.C.* 4. 25; Arist. *Eth. Nicom.* 1. 17. 17 *περιγεγράφθω*; Liban. 43. 16 *προσγεγράφθω*; Lucian and Arrian, *ἀναγεγράφθω*. Lucian is also fond of *δεδόχθω*, while *δεδόσθω* is found in Strabo (1. 4. 3), Lucian, Polyb., Philodemus, Eusebius, Themist., Philostr., Plotin., Dionys. Hal., and Dio Chrys. (*ἀποδοδέσθω*). The range of verbs is greater than in the pre-Aristotelian sphere: *πεφροιμιάσθω* (*Eth. Nicom.* 1. 3. 8), *προήχθω* (*Log.* 12 D), *τεθεωρήσθω* (*Dial.* 31), *κεκινήσθω* (*Phys.* 7. 223 A), *λελύσθω* (Plut. *Mor.* 195 F, *Fab. Max.* 20; Heliod. 2. 1), *δεδαπανήσθω* (*Per.* 14. 1), *τετολμήσθω* (*Mor.* 418 D), *συγκατατετάχθω* (546 B), *συγκεχωρήσθω* (570 C; Jos. *Antiq.* 4. 8. 23), *βεβλήσθω* (Anth. Pal. 12. 117. 1), *ἐξαηλίφθω* (Luc. 40. 26), *προτετιμήσθων* (44. 7), *ἀνεσταυρώσθω* (1. 1), *νενομοθετήσθω* (5. 42), *ἐκκεκόφθω* (15. 2), *ἀποτετιμήσθω* (*ib.*), *ἀνεσπάσθω* (15. 49), *ἀνιμήσθω* (15. 50), *ἐμβεβλήσθω* (10. 30. 1), *ἀνερρίφθων* (*Cha. and Her.*), 227; Aelian, *Nat. An.* 16. 15; Appian, *Mithr.* 2, *Illyr.* 6, *B.C.* 4. 67. The perfect pass. of *λέγω* in any form occurs only six times in Plato. See *A.J.P.* X. 439.

ἀνερρίφθω (Plut. *Caes.* 32, *Mor.* 206, *Pomp.* 60. 2; Appian, *B.C.* 2. 35; Athen. 13. 559 E), κεκρίσθω (Luc. 10. 12. 7; Liban. *Epist.* 91), τεθάφθω (9. 9. 1), δεδόσθω (25. 37; Polyb. 16. 12. 11; Aristides 54. 73), καταδεδικάσθω (Luc. 16. 28), δεδέσθω, μεμετρήσθω (7. 13, 39. 6), κεκοσμήσθω (25. 44, 39. 16), εικάσθω (39. 19), ἀπεσκώφθω (54. 8), ἀνορωρύχθω (66. 20), καταλείφθω (73. 20), κατεγνώσθω (48. 38), ἀπολελύσθωσαν (13. 2. 3), δεδηλώσθω (3. 7. 7, 4. 8. 49, 8. 9. 1, 9. 11. 1; Pausan. 5. 27. 6), ἀπολελείφθω (Jos. *B.I.* 7. 11. 15), ἐξητάσθω (Pausan. 3. 18. 5, 5. 3. 1), τετύχθω (Quint. Smyrn. 12. 300; Aratus 725), πεπεράνθω (Athen. 13. 53), σεσάχθω (7. 45, 14. 81), ἐσφάχθω (14. 663 D), πεπεραιώσθω (11. 509 E), ἐπιτετάχθων and συντετάχθων (Arrian, ἑκταξίς κατ' Ἀλάνων), τετάχθω (*ib.*; Aelian, *V. Hist.* 2. 41), προβεβλήσθω (*ib.*), προτετηρήσθω (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 1. 6. 11), εἰσήχθω (*Praep. Ev.* 7. 8. 26), τετιμήσθω (*ib.* 2. 3. 41; Ar. *An.* 5. 19. 6), συγκεχωρήσθω (Euseb. Pamphil. *adv. Hierocl.*), ἀνεώχθω (Liban. 47. 27), κεκρίσθω (48. 41), τετολμήσθω (*Epist.* 64), τετηρήσθω (Euseb. *Dem. Ev.* 4. 15. 31, *Praep. Ev.* 11 *Proem.*), λελογίσθω (14. 5. 11), ἐπιτετηρήσθω (*Dem. Ev.* 1. 6. 53), γεγυμνάσθω (3. 5. 69), ἱστορήσθω (*Hist. Eccl.* 5. 28. 19; Luc. 39. 4), ἀπολελύσθω (*Hist. Eccl.* 4. 13. 7; Luc. 39. 4), παρατεθείσθω (3. 10. 6), πεφροντίσθω (Onosander 40), κεχρήσθω (50), ἀπολελείφθων (97), διακεκρίσθω (Iamblichus 192), κεκρίσθω (Luc. 10. 2. 7), συγκεκρίσθω (Appian, *B.C.* 2. 151), ἐμπεπλάσθω (Soranus, *Gynaec.*, Rose, p. 309), δεδείχθω (Themistius), προηπορήσθω (*ib.*), ἡπορήσθω (Theophr. *Hist. Pl.* 9. 19. 4), κεκρατύνθω (Porphyry, *Epist. ad Marcellam* 24), ἀνήχθω, κεκλήσθω, ἀνήφθω, κεκλήσθων (Aristides 3. 33, 13. 206, 1. 6, 3. 33, 8. 92), ἀνήφθω (Philostr. 57), συγκεκεφαλαιώσθω (Stob. *Flor.*, Meineke, p. 62), κεχωρίσθω (*ib.*), ἀναβεβλήσθω (Zonaras 13. 10); Philostr. *V. Arol.* 1. 13, 8. 26), ἀναβεβλήσθων (7. 22), ἀπηλλάχθω (6. 11), ἀποπεφάνθω (7. 39, 8. 20; *V. Soph.* 213, 265), εικάσθω (*ib.* 212; Luc. 39, 19), ἀπολελογήσθω (*V. Soph.* 269), ἐρρώσθων (269, 324, 404), εὔχθω (297), κεκληρώσθω (365), κατεσκευάσθων (*Gym.* 33), συντετάχθων (*ib.*), ὑπεστάλθω (35), προβεβλήσθω (*Imag.* 380), τετολμήσθω (Nonnus 3. 2. 16, 6. 7. 1), ἐπεσκέφθω (4. 5. 6), νενομοθετήσθω

(Justin. *Const.* 10, 42, 48), *συνήφθω* (25), *ὑποκεκλίσθω* (31), *τετάχθω* (48; Aelian, *V. Hist.* 2. 41), *ἐρρίφθω* (Heliod. 2. 1), *ἡνύσθω* (*ib.*), *ἐσπείσθω* (3. 11), *ἐπιτετράφθω* (3. 16), *ἐπικεκλήσθω* (4. 8), *ἐπικεχειροτονήσθω* (4. 21), *εἰσκεκλήσθω* (7. 23), *πεπαύσθω* (7. 24), *κατατετάχθω* (*ib.*), *τετιμήσθω* (9. 10; Ar. *An.* 5. 19. 6), *λελέχθω* (Stob. *Oec.* 19 from Callicratidas), *παρηγγέλθω* (Zaleucus, Stob., Meineke, IV, 246), *ἐστάλθω* (Nicostratus), *συνεστάλθω* (*ib.*), *ἐκβεβλήσθω καὶ συνεστάτω . . . καὶ συμπιπτέτωσαν* (Proclus 26. 17), *διαπεπεράνθω* (*Def.* 15), *ἐκβεβλήσθω* (*Petit.* 4), *τετμήσθω* (very often), *ἀναγεγράφθω, καταγεγράφθωσαν, ἐξεύχθω, ἐπέξεύχθωσαν, προστετάχθω, εἰλήφθω, γεγονέτω, ἐπέξεύχθω* (most frequent), *προσεκβεβλήσθω, ἐκβεβλήσθωσαν, ἦχθω, προσειλήφθω, εἰρήσθω, εἰλήφθωσαν, διηρήσθω* (all in Proclus).

The periphrastic perfect imperative of the third person is sometimes found: Arist. *Phys.* 5. 224 B ἔστω γὰρ πεπερασμένον . . . ἔστω διεληλυθός (7. 233 B), 9. 265 A ἔστω τοσαῦθ' ἡμῖν εἰρημένα, *Met.* 1. 988 A ἔστω . . . εἰρημένα; Plut. *Μοκ.* 17 F ἀκηκόως ἔστω; Nonnus 9. 65 πεφυλαγμένον ἔστω. The form *εἰρημένος ἔστω* occurs as early as Homer (Θ 524), and is hardly to be distinguished from *εἰρήσθω*. So in later Greek *ἔστω λεγόμενον* = *λεγέσθω* and *ἔστωσαν ἄγοντες* = *ἀγόντων*. In Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3. 2. 1, we find the regular form of the imperative combined with the periphrastic: *ἔστω οὖν ἐκεῖνα τεθεωρημένα καὶ ὠρίσθω*. The periphrastic perfect can resume its feeling by transposition. Cp. Ap. Rhod. 3. 10 *σάκος πεπαλαγμένος ἔστω*, Luc. 25. 34 *προσγεγεννημένη ἔστω*. In all moods sequence and position of copula and participle in the periphrastic conjugation affect the meaning. Cp. the French "Quels livres as-tu lus?" but "J'ai lu ces livres."

REDUPLICATED AORIST OPTATIVES.

Just as in Aristophanes, *Birds*, 1350, we have a reduplicated present (or aorist) subjunctive which many scholars have mistaken for a perfect, so also we find a few reduplicated optatives which seem at first glance to be perfects. In Manetho, Γ 229, we read *τετύχοιεν*, which is not a perfect,¹ but a late

¹ Cp. the perf. in N.T. *Heb.* viii. 6 *τέτυχεν*, Diod. Sic. 3. 9, and Jos. *B.I.* 7. 5. 4.

epic aorist optative of *τυγχάνω*. The subjunctives *νεμεσσήσῃ* and *ἀποκλίνωσιν* follow immediately. Again, in Maximus 12. 577, appears the form *τετύχῃσι*, a late epic second aorist subjunctive, followed (in verse 590) by the unreduplicated form *τύχῃσι*.¹ Finally, *πεπαγοίην*, cited by the scholiast on Ξ 241 from Eupolis,² is classified by Veitch as perfect. But Curtius writes *πεπᾶγοίην* (reduplicated second aorist). Cp. Veitch's comment on *ἔρριπε* (Oppian, *Cyn.* 4. 350): "Does this point to *theme* *ρίφω*? or may it be for *ἔρριπε*? or is it the perfect with *ι*, though it be naturally long?"

THE PRESENT PERFECT.

Aeschines says (2. 4): *ἐφοβήθην μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν τεθορύβημαι*. In this sentence the action of the first verb is over and gone; and no reference is made to the question, "What case stand I in?" The second verb designates a condition which exists at the time of speaking. Plainly the orator refers to his present state of mind. Cp. Soph. *Ai.* 139; Plato, *Lysis*, 210 E *κατιδὼν οὖν αὐτὸν ἀγωνιῶντα καὶ τεθορυβημένον*. So Brugmann (*Kurze vgl. Gram.* p. 494) says, "eine Handlung wird vor sich gehend vorgestellt, doch so, dass ein Terminus, der Ausgangs- oder Endpunkt, ins Auge gefasst wird." Cp. Xen. *Oec.* 9. 4 *πρὸς μεσημβρίαν ἀναπέπτῃται*. Aristotle makes some interesting observations on the perfect of certain verbs in *Met.* 1048 B: *τὸ τέλος καὶ ἡ πρᾶξις. οἶον ὁρᾷ καὶ ἑώρακε, φρονεῖ καὶ πεφρόνηκε, νοεῖ καὶ νενόηκεν. ἀλλ' οὐ μανθάνει καὶ μεμάθηκεν . . . οὐ γὰρ ἄμα βαδίζει καὶ βεβάδικεν . . . οὐδὲ γίγνεται καὶ γέγονεν, ἢ κινεῖται καὶ κεκίνηται, ἀλλ' ἕτερον καὶ κινεῖ καὶ κεκίνηκεν. ἑώρακε δὲ καὶ ὁρᾷ ἄμα τὸ αὐτὸ, καὶ νοεῖ καὶ νενόηκεν*. In the proverb *ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα* the participle has become a timeless adjective and the latter then substantivized by the article. Cp. *ἄνθρωπος ὑποβεβεργμένος, ἀνεφωγόσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, ἀναπεπταμένοις ὄμμασιν* (Liban. 35. 11). Similarly adverbs derived from perfect participles (which increase in number in later Greek) are, like the Romance words in

¹ Cp. the Homeric *δέδεξο*, which, though succeeded by *δέξο*, is considered by scholars to be a perfect.

² See Kock, I, p. 366.

-ment, -mente, merely adverbialized adjectives : τεθορυβημένως, καταπεφρονηκότως, υποπεπτωκότως, τεταγμένως, υπερβεβλημένως, γεγυμνωμένως, τεταραγμένως, τετολμηκότως, πεφρονημένως, καταπεπλαγμένως, καταπεπυκασμένως, ἐπεσκιασμένως, ἀπηρτισμένως, ἐσκεμμένως. Cp. the adjectival and participial combinations : B 61, Eur. *Ion* 680 ἅπαις ἧ καὶ λελειμμένη τέκνων ; Xen. *Hell.* 2. 1. 28 διεσκεδασμένων δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὄντων ; Plato, *Theaet.* 194 D βαθύς τε καὶ πολὺς καὶ λείος καὶ κεχαρισμένος ; *Phaedo*, 108 B ; Aesch. *Prom.* 829 λοιπὸν ἧ παρειμένον ; Lycurg. 68 ἀνόητος καὶ καταπεφρονηκός ; Galen 3. 909 εὐτονόν θ' ἄμα καὶ ἡπυειγμένον ; Lys. 14. 2 ; Libanius 39. 15 ἄνδρε καλῶ τε κἀγαθῶ καὶ πεπαιδευμένῳ, 41. 14 καλῶ τε κἀγαθῶ, δικαίῳ, πρᾶῳ, φρονίμῳ, περὶ παιδείαν διατετριφότε. The perfect participle passive is now a verb, now a pure adjective, like *scelestus*, *molestus*, without predication (*paratus*, *peritus*, *notus*). Cp. the German "Er hat einen Brief geschrieben" with the Spanish "tiene escrita una carta," or "Die Bedingungen sind herausgegeben worden" with "las condiciones han sido publicadas."¹ In the words of Brugmann (*op. cit.* p. 560), the perfect "bezeichnete im Allgemeinen einen aus einer vorausgegangenen Handlung erfolgten Zustand." So βέβηκε, like *jagāma*, may mean, according to the connection, "he is here" or "he is not here"; but in both cases it is the present state, case, or condition of the subject that is proclaimed. The actual time of the perfect forms of βαίνω (which figures so prominently among the so-called perfect subjunctives in the classical literature)² is shown very prettily in some passages found in later authors; e.g. Lucian, φιλοψευδής, 40 πετόμενον ἢ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕδατος βεβηκότα, *Musc. Encom.* ἐπὶ τεττάρων βεβηκυῖαν ἔχουσάν τι ἐν ταῖν χερσίν, *Imag.* 480 βεβηκότα καὶ . . . πατοῦντα ; Plut. *Marcel.* 22 ἐπὶ τοῦ τεθρίππου βεβηκώς (cp. *Mar.* 27 ἐπὶ τῶν ἁμαξῶν . . . ἐφεστῶσαι) ; Dion.

¹ Both conceptions are found in old French. Cp. "Quant il li a faite sa couche" with the modern "Quand il lui a fait sa couche." Academic influence prevailed and the participle won the day. So in Italian the tendency is toward the French norm: "Ho scritto (or scritta) la lettera," but "La lettera che ho scritta (or scritto)." In Spanish *escrito* in every position with *he*, but *escrita* with *tengo*.

² See *Class. Rev.* XIX, 350.

Hal. *Rom. Antiq.* 6. 1202 ἐπὶ τοσαύτης βεβηκότης εὐτυχίας, 3. 7. 10 εὐ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἔτι βεβηκυῖαν; Strabo 2. 4. 2 γωνία βεβηκυῖα ἐπὶ τοῦ Πορθμοῦ καὶ τῶν Στηλῶν; Dio Chrys. 33. 399 ἀσφαλῶς βεβηκῶς καὶ ἐπὶ κινήμασιν δασύς, 60. 603 ἐπὶ σφαίρας βεβηκυῖαν . . . ἐπ' ἀνοίας ἑστηκότας; Philostr. 323 ἡ κεφαλὴ δὲ ἐβεβήκει ἐπ' αὐχένος; Plotinus, *En.* 6. 9 σωφροσύνην ἐν ἀγνώ βεβώσαν. In a comic fragment quoted by Kock (II, 148) ἐκβέβηκε is used with twenty presents. The shift from βεβηκῶς, the real perfect, to βεβηκῶς = ἑστῶς is analogous to the shift in ἰών, ἴοι, ἰέναι, which, in classical prose, are sometimes future, sometimes present. Just as the numeral εἷς changes and becomes an indefinite pronoun (like the Plautine *unum*, which turns into the French *un*), e.g. ἐνὸς αἰτοῦ (*N.T. Rev.* viii. 13), so, too, participles transform themselves into adjectives; perfect tenses, as the color of the verb changes, turn into presents; and often with the transformation of language and function goes a corresponding change in time, as, e.g. the pluperfect *fuisse* becomes the imperfect *fusse*.

γέγονα AND γεγένημαι.

The perfect of γίγνομαι is not only γέγονα, but also γεγένημαι (χθιζά τε καὶ πρωιζά γεγενημένα, Plato, 2 *Alcib.* 141 D). The former is a present, like πέφυκα, and τὰ γεγονότα is equivalent to a qualified τὰ ὄντα, whereas τὰ γεγενημένα = τὰ παρεληλυθότα (as in Dem. 24. 106 τοῖς γεγενημένοις . . . τοῖς οὖσιν . . . τοῖς μέλλουσιν ἔσεσθαι)¹ — τὸ μὲν γὰρ γεγενημένον οὐδὲ θεῷ δυνατόν ἐστι ποιῆσαι ἀγένητον (Plut. *Consol. ad Apol.*). But τὸ ὄν is not necessarily τὸ γεγονός (for we can conceive of τὰ ὄντα γένεσιν οὐκ ἔχοντα), which is τὸ ὄντως οὐδέποτε ὄν and at the same time τὸ ὄντως οὐδέποτε γεγενημένον. Cp. Plato, *Tim.* 27 E, *Parmen.* 155; Aristides 1. 13 ἅπαντα γίγνεται τε καὶ γέγονε; Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* 11. 9. 7 προσήκει γίνεσθαι διὰ χρόνον, οὐδὲ γενέσθαι ποτέ, οὐδὲ γεγονέναι νῦν, οὐδ' εἰσαυθὺς ἔσεσθαι τὸ παράπαν . . . οὐδὲ μέλλον οὐδὲ παρῳχημένον μόνον ἐστὶ τὸ κατ' αὐτὸ ὄντως ὄν, οὐ γεγονὸς οὐδὲ ἐσόμενον.

¹ Cp. Xen. *Hiero.* 1. 2 ἰδιώτην γεγενημένον καὶ νῦν τύραννον ὄντα, Just. M. 1 *Apol.* 23 πρεσβύτερα πάντων τῶν γεγενημένων συγγραφέων, 31 ἐν τῷ νῦν γεγενημένῳ Ἰουδαϊκῷ πολέμῳ.

But the verb *εἶναι* lacked a perfect, and to fill the vacancy, as Greece came more and more under Roman sway, and the need of an equivalent of *fuisse* was more sorely felt, *γεγονέναι* assumed the meaning of the Latin perfect infinitive of the copulative verb. Hence the disproportionate number of *γεγονέναι*'s in post-classical Greek.¹ Lysias says *πρὶν ἡμέρας πέντε γενέσθαι* (7. 9), whereas Plato writes *πρὶν ἕξ μῆνας γεγονέναι* (*Protag.* 320 A). Thucydides has not a single example of *γέγονα* in any form, whereas 87 *γενέσθαι*'s in the infinitive alone appear, and 49 *γίγνεσθαι*'s. In the Lysianic corpus there are 59 *γενέσθαι*'s and only 8 *γεγονέναι*'s. Lysias has 33 *γέγονα*'s against 120 *γεγέννημαι*'s. Aristophanes has a solitary *γεγονέναι* (*natum esse*, *Eq.* 446). The total absence of the form in Euripides may be due to metrical exigencies. Nevertheless, the prose writers Isocrates, Lysurgus, and Dinarchus also avoid the form.² Eusebius says (*Praep. Ev.* 14. 15. 11) Ἀρχελάου δὲ ἀκουστῆς γεγονέναι λέγεται Σωκράτης, where Herodotus would probably have written λέγεται εἶναι. Cp. Diod. Sic. 1. 24. 8 φασὶ δὲ καὶ τὸν Περσέα γεγονέναι κατ' Αἴγυπτον, Dio Chrys. 22. 276 πότερον δοκεῖ σοι εἶναι ἄνθρωπος εὐδαίμων, εἰ δὲ μὴ, γεγονέναι, ἢ ἔσεσθαι.³ In the Septuagint γίγνεσθαι is used as an auxiliary, instead of εἶναι, with the present and perfect participles. So in Aeschylus γίγνεσθαι = εἶναι, as Dindorf at the end of his list remarks: "Plura inter haec sunt exempla ubi verbum substantivum poni poterat."

¹ This must be said, however, with one qualification: Plato seems to be inordinately fond of the infinitive *γεγονέναι*, which he uses not only in the sense of *natum esse*, but also as a past infinitive of *εἶμι* in passages where another writer might have used simply *εἶναι* (or *γενέσθαι*). For variety of expression he also employs *γεγονώς* and *γεγενημένος* as equivalents. Cp. *Leg.* 951 C and D *γεγονώς ἔστω . . . ἔστω γεγενημένος*.

² In Homer *γενέσθαι* occurs 35 times, *γίγνεσθαι* and *γεγονέναι* not at all. There are over 300 examples of some form of the verb in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but not a single occurrence of *γεγέννημαι*, whereas *γέγονα* occurs 30 times.

³ Nevertheless, there are abundant examples of this use of *γέγονα* in Plato: *Leg.* 641 C *γέγονασί τε καὶ ἔσονται*, 638 A, 884 A *γέγονε καὶ ἔστι καὶ ἔσται*, *Ion* 532 E, *Rep.* 402 E, 604 C *περὶ τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ . . . πρὸς τὰ πεπτωκότα*, 392 D *γεγονόντων ἢ ὄντων ἢ μελλόντων*, *Tim.* 22 C *φθοραὶ γεγόνασιν . . . καὶ ἔσονται*, *Protag.* 320 B *γεγονέναι . . . μεμαθηκέναι . . . ἐξευρηκέναι*, *Laches* 198 B *τὰ γεγονότα . . . τὰ παρόντα . . . τὰ προσδοκώμενα*, 198 D *γιγνόμενα καὶ γεγονότα καὶ γενησόμενα*. Cp. Aristides 1. 19 *ἔστι τε καὶ γεγένηται καὶ γενήσεται*.

CONCLUSION.

In the whole range of Greek literature I have found only 55 forms (34 verbs) of the perfect subjunctive active.¹ Of these the following 38 are unquestionably present in meaning: ἀνεώγη, ἀρήρη, βεβρύχη, γεγόνη, δεδίη, δεδίωσι, ἐστήκη, παρεστήκη, καθεστήκη, ἐπανεστήκη, συνεστήκη, ξυνεστήκη, ἐφεστήκη, ἐστήκωμεν, ἐστήκωσι, ἐστῶ, ἐστῶμεν, ἐστῶσι, ἐφεστῶσι, εἰοίχης, ἐγρηγόρη, κατεάγωσι, κεχήνη, κεκλάγω, κεκέυθη, μεμήλη, μεμύκη, ὀλώλη, ὀρώρη, ὀδώδη, πεποιθῶ, πεποιθῆς, πεποιθόμεν, πεφύκη, ἐμπεφύη, ἐρρίγησι, τεθήλη, τεθνήκωσι. The example πεπλήγη, cited by many, as we have seen, is not a perfect. The subjunctives συμβεβήκη (omitted by La Roche), προβεβήκη, βεβήκης, and βεβήκη are really presents in feeling, and the present force seems to manifest itself more and more in the later literature, particularly in the participle; βεβρίθωσι becomes a present from its meaning alone; the same may be said of ἡχθοφορήκη, while both λελήθη and πεπόνθη are also desperately present. There remain only seven verbs: ἀπειλήφη, εἰλήφωσι, ὑπειλήφωσι, εὐρήκη, κεκλόφωσι, κεκοινωνήκωσι, ὠφλήκη, πεποιήκη, πεπονήκη. Since εἴληφα (like εὔρηκα) is an exceedingly common form, εἰλήφη is brought within the range of possibility. Moreover, the past act of εἴληφα vanishes into the present ownership (= ἔχω, κέκτημαι). The hither end of the performance (if we look toward the past) is viewed to the exclusion of the inception. Compare the good old English "I have got" (in contradistinction to the modern "I have") with Libanius 29. 17 ὁ πληγὰς εἰληφώς, and the Homeric ἐπὶ νῆας ἀφήσω πεπληγώς: "ich werde dich wegtreiben, indem du meine Schläge auf dir hast" (Brugmann, p. 565).² Furthermore, when Plato uses ἀπειλήφη (*Rep.* 614 A), he not only indicates by the tense that the act has reached its end, but to make the perfect

¹ I do not include εἰδῶ, of which alone there appear four times as many examples as all the rest together; and this single fact speaks volumes for the character of the Greek perfect subjunctive. Some of the examples in later Greek I may have missed, since I went over the ground but once; and some of the texts are so wretched that it is, as Libanius says, ἀγδὲς συγγράμμασι δοῦναι τὰ δμματα.

² A discussion of the forms πεπληγώς, πεπλήγοντες will be published elsewhere.

doubly perfect, he adds the adverb of perfectness (τελέως), and to εἰλήφωσι (*Polit.* 269 C) is appended the temporal ἤδη. Stress is also laid on the present ownership in κεκλόφωσι (*Ar. Eq.* 1149). True, the Greeks might have used the perfect forms even of the verbs we find in the paradigms of our grammars, had they so desired; but they preferred the aorist, and the aorist they used to the exclusion of the perfect. Sometimes a temporal expression is added to bring out the relation with greater clearness, e.g. παλινοφδοῦσιν, ἀνευχόμενοι ἅττ' ἂν τὸ πρῶτον εὔξωνται (*Plato, 2 Alcib.* 142 D. *Cr.* 148 D.)

Of the perfect optatives in the active voice (several of which La Roche fails to register) only 67 forms (45 verbs) appear.¹ Twenty of these are indubitably present: ἀπολώλοι, ἀπολώλοιεν, ἀφεςταίη, συνεστήκοι, ἀφεςτήκοι, ἀφεςτήκοιεν, προεστήκοι, γεγόνοι, εἰκοί, καθεστήκοι, κέειτο, μεμῆνοι, πεποιθοί, πεφύκοι, τεθνήκοι, τεθναίην, τεθναίης, τεθναίη, τεθναίην, τετλαίη. The Herodotean ἡλώκοι is passive in meaning, while βεβήκοι, ἀποβεβήκοι, λελλήθοι, πεπόνθοι, πεπόνθοιμεν, πεπόνθοιεν, πεπονθοίη, πεποιήκοι, and πεποιήκοιεν are counterparts of the subjunctive forms already discussed.² The remaining examples, most of which are in oblique construction, are: δεδράκοι, ἡρήκοι, ἡρήκοιεν, καθηρήκοι, εξαπατήκοι, ἐσβεβλήκοιεν (for the present signification of the perfect βέβληκα, see *Plato, Tim.* 24 D), βεβρώκοι, ἐπιδεδώκοι, παραδεδώκοιεν, εἰρήκοι, περιελήλυθοι, ἐπανελήλυθοι, εὐρήκοι, ἀνευρήκοι, ἐσχήκοι, ἐκκεκηρύχοι, ἱστορήκοι, κεκρατήκοι, ἀπεκτόνοι, ἀπεκτονήκοι, καταλελοίποιοι, καταμεμαθήκοι, νενικήκοι, συμπεπνεύκοι, πεπτώκοι, ἐμπεπτώκοι, πεφεύγοι, ἐκπεφευγοίην, ἐσπουδάκοιεν, τεθύκοι, τετελευτήκοι, ὑπηρετήκοι, ἀποκεχωρήκοι, ὠρμήκοι, ἐξωρμήκοι, ὠφλήκοι, and probably ἐδηδοκοίη.

Of the perfect imperative active 26 of the 28 examples are present: ἄνωχθι, ἄνωχθε, δέδιθι, δείδιθι, δέδιχθι, δείδιτε, ἐγρήγορθε, ἔσταθι, ἔστατον, ἔστατε, παρέστατε, ἐστάτω, κέκραχθι, κέκραχθε, κεχήνετε, κεκράγετε, τέτλαθι, τετλάτω, τέθναθι,

¹ Forms like βεβρώθοις, ἰλήκοις, ἰλήκοι, μεμάποιοι, and εἰδείην, εἰδείης, etc., are not included.

² See *Class. Rev.* XIX, 349 f.

τεθνάτω, τεθηπέτω, κεχηνέτω, μεμάτω, ἀκηκοέτω, δεδορκέτω (intensive), βεβηκέτω. The remaining two, εἰληφέτω and μεμαθηκέτω, have a strong tendency to become presents.

Of the 31 middle forms of the second person the vast majority are real presents: ἀλάλησο, δέδεξο, δέδεχθε, ἔρρωσο, ἔρρωσθε, ἦσο, κάθησο, κάθησθον, κάθησθε, κείσο, κατάκεισο, κέκτησο, κέκλησο, κέκλισο, μέμνησο, μέμνεο, μέμνησθε, καταπέπληχθε, πεπάλασθε, πεπάλαχθε, πέπαυσο, πέπεισο, πέπνυσσο, πεποίησο, πεπόνησο, πέπρησο, πεφόβησθε, πεφύλαξο, πεφύλαχθε, πεποίθετε, πέπεισθι. On the last example, which is found in Aesch. *Eum.* 599, Veitch remarks, "a rare form; πέπεισθι or πέποιθι would perhaps be more analogical"; and Dindorf says, "in M. adscriptum est ζτ (*i.e.* ζήτει), quia librarium offenderat haec forma cuius alia exempla nulla reperiuntur."

Of the perfect imperative passive there are about five hundred examples in the extant literature.